Application No.: 09/893,554

Page 4

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-3, 5, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (US 5,831,374) in view of Applicant's Related Art FIGs. 1 and 2.

Claims 4, 6, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. in view of Applicant's Related Art FIGs. 1 and 2 and further in view of Sreeram et al. (US 6,140,759).

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. in view of Applicant's Related Art FIGs. 1 and 2 and further in view of Konishi et al. (US 5,957,743).

## Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant cancels withdrawn claims 12-20 without prejudice or disclaimer, amended claims 1 and 5 to more clearly define the invention, and added new claim 21. Accordingly, claims 1-11 and 21 are pending for consideration.

Applicant also submits herewith a Submission of Formal Drawings.

# All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 5, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (US 5,831,374) in view of Applicant's Related Art FIGs. 1 and 2; claims 4, 6, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. in view of Applicant's Related Art FIGs. 1 and 2 and further in view of Sreeram et al. (US 6,140,759); and claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. in

Application No.: 09/893,554

Page 5

view of Applicant's Related Art FIGs. 1 and 2 and further in view of Konishi et al. (US 5,957,743).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references, taken individually and in combination, that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1 and 5, and hence dependent claims 2-4 and 6-10.

With respect to independent claim 1, as amended, the applied art, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest a combination including a flat luminescence lamp having a patterned layer formed on the second surface of the first substrate, wherein the patterned layer includes a plurality of grooves formed through the patterned layer to expose portions of the second surface of the first substrate. Similarly, with respect to independent claim 5, as amended, the applied art, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest a combination including a flat luminescence lamp having a patterned layer formed on the second surface of the first substrate, and a plurality of grooves formed through the patterned layer exposing portions of the second surface of the first substrate.

The Office Action alleges that FIG. 1 of Morita et al. discloses a plurality of grooves 21 formed on the second surface of the first substrate. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, the bottom glass substrate 1b has a heat sink 2 is bonded onto a back surface 11 of the bottom glass substrate 1b. Thus, Morita et al. does not disclose a patterned layer formed on the second surface of the first substrate, wherein the patterned layer includes a plurality of grooves formed through the patterned layer to expose portions of the second surface of the first substrate, as recited by amended independent claim 1. Similarly, with

Application No.: 09/893,554

Page 6

regard to independent claim 5, as amended, Morita et al. does not disclose a patterned layer formed on the second surface of the first substrate, and a plurality of grooves formed through the

patterned layer exposing portions of the second surface of the first substrate.

Applicant further asserts that the Office Action does not rely on Applicant's Related Art

FIGs. 1 and 2, <u>Sreeram et al.</u> and/or <u>Konishi et al.</u> to teach the features described above.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that Applicant's Related Art FIGs. 1 and 2, Sreeram et

al. and/or Konishi et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies noted above.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-4 and 6-10 are allowable for all of the reasons discussed above with regard to independent claims 1 and 5, from

which they depend, as well as the individual features each of dependent claims 2-4 and 6-10

recite.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) should be withdrawn because Morita et al., Applicant's Related Art FIGs. 1 and 2,

<u>Sreeram et al.</u> and <u>Konishi et al.</u>, whether taken individually or in combination, neither teach nor

suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in amended independent claims 1 and 5,

and hence dependent claims 2-4 and 6-10.

New Claim 21

Applicant has added new claim 21 to further define the invention. Applicant respectfully

submits that new claim 21 is allowable.

Application No.: 09/893,554

Page 7

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely

allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding

after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's

undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made by the current amendment.

The attachment is captioned "VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES

MADE."

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge

the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also

be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: David B. Hardy

Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: March 27, 2003

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629** 

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Application No.: 09/893,554

Page 8

#### VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Withdrawn claims 12-20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

1.(Amended) A flat luminescence lamp, comprising:

a first substrate having a first surface and a second surface;

a second substrate having a first surface disposed facing opposite to the first surface of the first substrate:

a first luminescence layer formed on the first surface of the first substrate;

a second luminescence layer formed on the first surface of the second substrate;

and[-,]

<u>a patterned layer formed on the second surface of the first substrate,</u>

<u>wherein the patterned layer includes</u> a plurality of grooves formed <u>through the</u>

<u>patterned layer to expose portions of [on]</u> the second surface of the first substrate.

Claim 5 has been amended as follows:

5.(Amended) A flat luminescence lamp, comprising:

a first substrate having a first surface and a second surface;

a patterned layer formed on the second surface of the first substrate;

a plurality of grooves formed through the patterned layer exposing portions of

[on] the second surface of the first substrate;

Application No.: 09/893,554

Page 9

a second substrate having a first surface and a second surface, the first surface of the first substrate opposing the first surface of the second substrate;

a plurality of first electrodes formed on the first surface of the first substrate;
a plurality of second electrodes formed on the first surface of the second substrate
opposing the first electrodes;

a first fluorescent material layer formed on the first surface of the first substrate; a second fluorescent material layer formed on the first surface of the second substrate opposing the first fluorescent material layer; and

a plurality of frame portions formed on the first surface of the first substrate and the first surface of the second substrate to seal the first substrate and the second substrate.